

MINUTES
CITY OF RIVERSIDE
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
1,874th Meeting



9:00 a.m. January 20, 2005
COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL
3900 MAIN STREET

**MINUTES APPROVED AS PRESENTED
AT THE MAY 19, 2005 MEETING**

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Agnew, Brown, Comer, Densmore, Kurani, Leonard, Singletary, Stephens

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Norton

STAFF PRESENT:

- Gutierrez, Planning Director
- Swiecki, Principal Planner
- Coyazo, Senior Planner
- Belier, Senior Planner
- Dinkel, Associate Planner
- Sennewald, Associate Planner
- Violette, Assistant Planner
- Nahill, Contract Planner
- VanZanten, Sr. Engineer
- Smith, Deputy City Attorney
- Ramos, Stenographer

THE FOLLOWING BUSINESS WAS CONDUCTED:

Chair Agnew called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

The Pledge of Allegiance was given to the Flag.

Commissioner Densmore announced that today is John Swiecki's last meeting of the Planning Commission as he is relocating to Northern California. The Commission wished Mr. Swiecki fond farewell.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLANNING/ZONING MATTERS FROM THE AUDIENCE	7
CONSENT CALENDAR	7
1. PLANNING CASE P04-1469: Proposed design review by the City of Riverside Park & Recreation Department for the construction of a 11,596 square-foot fitness center addition attached to the southerly portion of the existing 12,085 square-foot Arlanza Community Center building at John Bryant Park, an approximately 20.7-acre neighborhood park located on the southerly side of Philbin Avenue between Wohlstetter Street and Corwin Lane in the O — Official Zone.	7
2. PLANNING CASE P04-1392: Proposal by Richmond American Homes for the Design Review of the plot plan and building elevations for an approved planned residential development consisting of 55 single family detached residences together with parking, private and common open space on approximately 6.87 acres of vacant land located at 4962 Dewey Avenue, situated on the southerly side of Dewey Avenue, westerly of Carlo Way, in the in the R-1-65 - Single Family Residential Zone.	7
3. PLANNING CASE P04-1382: Proposal for design review of a plot plan and building elevations by Gary Fairchild on behalf of Sterling Housing, for a 152 unit, 528 bedroom, student housing complex together with commercial retail lease space on approximately 5.15 acres at 1300, 1360 and 1410 University Avenue, situated on the south side of University Avenue, west of Iowa Avenue, in the C-2-SP - Restricted Commercial and Specific Plan (University Avenue) Combining Zones.	8
4. PLANNING CASE P04-0950 (<i>Continued from January 6, 2005</i>) : Proposal by Pete Mitchell on behalf of EMS Real Estate for the Design Review of the plot plan and building elevations for an approved senior citizens housing project consisting of 224 one and two-bedroom independent senior apartment units on approximately 10.7 acres developed with two single family residences situated southerly of Colorado Avenue, westerly of Snowberry Avenue and Adams Elementary School and northerly of Raintree Avenue, in the R-1-65 - Single Family Residential Zone. (<i>Related Planning Case - P04-0075.</i>) (<i>The applicant requests continuance off calendar and staff concurs.</i>)	9
DISCUSSION CALENDAR	10
5. ADMINISTRATIVE PLANNING CASE P04-1080: Proposed Minor Conditional Use Permit by Mark Moscal on behalf of Nations Rent to install a 2,000 gallon above ground fuel tank for non-commercial use at an existing equipment rental and storage facility on approximately 6 acres located at 3275 Columbia Avenue, situated at the northwesterly corner of Columbia Avenue and Primer Street, in the C-3 General Commercial Zone.	10
6. PLANNING CASE P04-1416: Proposal for design review of building elevations by Eric Sautter, AIA on behalf of Rufus Barkley, for the exterior remodeling of two office-industrial buildings, totaling approximately 40,000-square-feet in area, on 3 acres, situated on the southeasterly corner of Kansas Avenue and La Cadena Drive, in the M-1— Light Manufacturing Zone.	11
7a. PLANNING CASE P04-0803 (<i>Continued from January 6, 2005</i>): Proposed Tract Map 32476 by CSL Engineering on behalf of the Merickel Companies to subdivide approximately 23 acres of vacant land into 34 lots for the future development of single family residences, situated on the southerly side of the future extension of Norwood Avenue, westerly of College Avenue, in the RC - Residential Conservation and R-1-65-Single Family Residential Zones. (<i>This case is being concurrently heard with Planning Case P04-0967.</i>) (<i>The applicant requests further continuance to the February 17, 2005 meeting and staff concurs.</i>)	13
7b. PLANNING CASE P04-0967 (<i>Continued from January 6, 2005</i>): Proposed general plan amendment by CSL Engineering on behalf of the Merickel Companies to amend the General Plan	

- land use designation for approximately 8.8 acres of vacant land situated on the southerly side of the future extension of Norwood Avenue, westerly of College Avenue from RHS - Hillside Residential to RLD - Low Density Residential. *(This case is being heard concurrently with Planning Case P04-0803.) (The applicant requests further continuance to the February 17, 2005 meeting and staff concurs.)* 13
- 8a. PLANNING CASE P04-1120 *(Continued from January 6, 2005)*: Proposed conditional use permit by Kassab Ama to establish a service station and mini-mart with off-site alcohol sales on approximately one vacant acre, situated on the northerly corner of Market Street and Rivera Street, in the C-2 Restricted Commercial Zone. *(This case is being heard concurrently with P04-1157 and P04-1119.) (The applicant requests further continuance to February 3, 2005 and staff concurs.)* 13
- 8b. PLANNING CASE P04-1157 and P04-1119 *(Continued from January 6, 2005)*: Proposed conditional use permit by Kassab Ama to establish an approximately 5,000 square foot market with off-site alcohol sales, and a design review of the plot plan and building elevations for an approximately 10,000 square foot, one-story commercial building and related parking, on an approximately one vacant acre, situated on the northwesterly side of Rivera Street, between Market Street and Allstate Drive in the C-2 Restricted Commercial Zone. *(These cases to be heard concurrently with P04-1120.) (The applicant requests further continuance to February 3, 2005 and staff concurs.)* 13
9. PLANNING CASE P04-0728 *(Continued from January 6, 2005)*: Proposed conditional use permit by Keith and Alicia Cunningham to expand an elderly board and care facility to allow up to 18 ambulatory clients on approximately 1 acre, developed with an existing board and care facility at 3715 Monroe Street, situated the northeasterly side of Monroe Street, southeasterly of Magnolia Avenue, in the R-1-65 Single Family Residential Zone. *(The applicant requests further continuance to the February 3, 2005 meeting and staff concurs.)* 13
- 10a. PLANNING CASE P04-1289 *(Continued from January 6, 2005)*: Proposed conditional use permit by Terry Talley on behalf of Neal T. Baker Enterprises to construct an approximately 2,100 square foot fast food restaurant with a drive thru "Baker's" on approximately 1.06 vacant acres at 1300 West Blaine Street, situated on the southwesterly corner of Blaine Street and Iowa Avenue, in the C-2 - Restricted Commercial Zone. *(This case to be heard concurrently with Planning Cases P04-1290 and P04-1292.) (The applicant requests further continuance to the February 3, 2005 meeting and staff concurs.)* 13
- 10b. PLANNING CASE P04-1290 *(Continued from January 6, 2005)*: Proposed conditional use permit by William Navigato to construct and operate an approximately 2,244 square foot automotive oil change facility "Grease Monkey" on approximately 1.06 vacant acres at 1300 West Blaine Street, situated on the southwesterly corner of Blain Street and Iowa Avenue, in the C-2 - Restricted Commercial Zone. *(This case to be heard concurrently with Planning Cases P04-1289 and P04-1292.) (The applicant requests further continuance to the February 3, 2005 meeting and staff concurs.)* 13
- 10c. PLANNING CASE P04-1292 *(Continued from January 6, 2005)*: Design Review of Plot Plan and Building Elevations by Terry Talley on behalf of Neal T. Baker Enterprises for an approximately 2,100 square foot fast food restaurant with a drive thru and an approximately 2,244 square foot automotive oil change facility "Grease Monkey" on approximately 1.06 vacant acres at 1300 West Blaine Street, situated on the southwesterly corner of Blaine Street and Iowa Avenue, in the C-2 - Restricted Commercial Zone. *(This case to be heard concurrently with Planning Cases P04-1289 and P04-1290.) (The applicant requests further continuance to the February 3, 2005 meeting and staff concurs.)* 14

11. PLANNING CASE P04-1031 (*Continued from January 6, 2005*): Proposal of Eddy Sutiono, on behalf of the Sugarbush Properties, for variances related to the installation of two freestanding signs on 18 acres developed with a commercial center, "University Town Center", at 1756 University Avenue, situated on the southwest corner of University and Chicago Avenues, in the C-2 – Restricted Commercial Zone. Variances requested: 1) to allow a 40-foot high, double-face freestanding sign with a sign area of 250-square-feet and nine lines of copy along Chicago Avenue, where the Zoning Code allows a maximum 25-foot high, double-face freestanding sign with a maximum sign area of 100-square feet and three lines of copy; 2) to allow a 40-foot high, double-face freestanding sign with a sign area of 250-square-feet and nine lines of copy along University Avenue, where the Zoning Code allows a 6-foot high, double-face freestanding sign with a maximum sign area of 25-square-feet and two lines of copy. (*The applicant requests further continuance to February 17, 2005.*) 14
12. PLANNING CASES P04-1306 AND P04-1307: Proposed conditional use permit and the design review of a plot plan and building elevations by Reeves Associates on behalf of Lake Development Group to establish a 15,004 square-foot drug store with a drive-thru pharmacy and a 1,152 square-foot restaurant building on an approximately 1.23 acre site developed with a used car dealership and auto repair facility at 3375 Market Street, situated on the westerly side of Market Street between 3rd and 4th Streets, in the DSP-RC - Downtown Specific Plan - Raincross District. (*Staff recommends continuance off calendar.*) 14
13. PLANNING CASES P04-1302 & P04-1304 (*Continued from January 6, 2005*): Proposal of Canty Engineering Group, Inc. on behalf of the Hindu Society of the Inland Empire for a revised conditional use permit and design review of a plot plan and building elevations to establish an approximately 34,000 square-foot two-story multiple purpose building including office and classroom space on approximately 2.28 acres of land developed with two single family residences and related accessory structures located at 3733 - 3771 Everest Avenue, situated on the easterly side of Everest Avenue, approximately 200 feet southerly of Magnolia Avenue in the R-1-65 - Single Family Residential and P - Parking Zones. 15
- 14a. PLANNING CASE P04-1358 (*Continued from January 6, 2005*): Proposal by Gilles Sayah for a variance related to the construction of an approximately 6,684 square foot commercial building on approximately 0.54 vacant acres at 2308 University Avenue, situated on the southwesterly corner of University and Eucalyptus Avenues, in the C-2-SP-Restricted Commercial and Specific Plan Combining Zone. Variance requested: to permit direct alley access to the proposed off-street parking area where an internal circulation system is required. (*This case to be heard concurrently with P04-1081*). 17
- 14b. PLANNING CASE P04-1081 (*Continued from January 6, 2005*): Proposal for design review of a plot plan and building elevations by Elias Alfata on behalf of Gill Sayah for an approximately 6,684 square foot commercial building on approximately 0.54 vacant acres at 2308 University Avenue, situated on the southwesterly corner of University and Eucalyptus Avenues, in the C-2-SP-Restricted Commercial and Specific Plan Combining and "P"-Parking Zones. (*This case to be heard concurrently with P04-1358*). 17
15. PLANNING CASE P04-1324: Proposed Parcel Map 33064 by IW Consulting Engineers, Inc. on behalf of Bill and Diana Reeves, to subdivide approximately 3.73 acres developed with a single family residence into two lots at 2525 Raeburn Drive situated at the terminus of Raeburn Drive and southerly of Victoria Avenue in the R-1-130 - Single Family Residential Zone. 18
16. PLANNING CASE P04-1354: Proposed Tract Map 31849 (revised) by Sake Engineers Inc, on behalf of Harry L. Young to subdivide approximately 4.18 acres into 19 lots, situated on the southwest corner of Tyler Street and Hedrick Avenue in the RR-Rural Residential (tentative R-1-

- 65-Single Family Residential) Zone. *(This case to be heard concurrently with P04-1452, P04-1453 and P04-1454)* 19
- 17a. PLANNING CASE P04-1452: Proposed Tract Map 33158 by Sake Engineers, Inc, on behalf of Harry Young, to subdivide approximately 3.18 vacant acres into 12 single family residential lots, situated on the east side of Jones Avenue, between Hedrick and Wells Avenues in the RR-Rural Residential (proposed R-1-65) Zone. *(This case to be heard concurrently with P04-1354, P04-1453 and P04-1454)* 20
- 17b. PLANNING CASE P04-1453: Proposed general plan amendment by Sake Engineers, Inc on behalf of Harry Young, to amend the land use designation of approximately 3.18 vacant acres, situated on the east side of Jones Avenue, between Hedrick and Wells Avenues, from the RSR-Semi-Rural Residential to the RMD-Medium Density Residential designation. *(This case to be heard concurrently with P04-1354, P04-1452 and P04-1454)* 20
- 17c. PLANNING CASE P04-1454: Proposed rezoning by Sake Engineers, Inc on behalf of Harry Young, to amend the Municipal Code (Title 19) to rezone approximately 3.18 vacant acres situated on the east side of Jones Avenue, between Hedrick and Wells Avenues, from the RR-Rural Residential Zone to the R-1-65-Single Family Residential Zone. *(This case to be heard concurrently with P04-1354, P04-1452 and P04-1453)* 20
- 18a. PLANNING CASE P04-1094: Proposed General Plan Amendment by Watt Developers to amend the land use designation of approximately 20 acres developed with a drive-in theater, situated between Van Buren Boulevard and Gibson Street approximately 680 feet northwesterly of Lincoln Avenue from the PKO Other Recreation to RMD Medium High Density Residential . *(This case is being heard concurrently with Planning Cases P04-1095, P04-1444, P04-1445 and P04-1446)* 23
- 18b. PLANNING CASE P04-1095: Proposed rezoning by Watt Developers to amend the Municipal Code (Title 19) to rezone approximately 20 acres of land developed with a drive-in theater, situated between Van Buren Boulevard and Gibson Street approximately 680 feet northwesterly of Lincoln Avenue, from the R-1-65 - Single Family Residential Zone to the R-3- 40 Multiple Family Residential Zone. *(This case is being heard concurrently with Planning Cases P04-1094, P04-1444, P04-1445 and P04-1446)* 23
- 18c. PLANNING CASE P04-1444: Proposed Tract Map 32659 by R.T. Quinn and Associates on behalf of Watt Developers to subdivide approximately 20 acres of land developed with a drive-in theater for condominium purposes to facilitate the development of a 206-unit small lot single family residential development, situated between Van Buren Boulevard and Gibson Street approximately 680 feet northwesterly of Lincoln Avenue in the R-1-65 -Single Family Residential Zone (Proposed R-3-40 - Multiple Family Residential Zone). *(This case is being heard concurrently with Planning Cases P04-1094, P04-1095 P04-1445 and P04-1446).* 23
- 18d. PLANNING CASES P04-1445 and P04-1446: Proposed planned residential development and the design review of a plot plan and building elevations by Watt Developers to establish a 206 unit small lot single family residential planned residential development together with parking, private and amenitized common open space areas on approximately 20 acres of land developed with a drive-in theater situated between Van Buren Boulevard and Gibson Street approximately 680 feet northwesterly of Lincoln Avenue, in the R-1-65 - Single Family Residential Zone (Proposed R-3-40 - Multiple Family Residential Zone). *(These cases are being heard concurrently with Planning Cases P04-1094, P04-1095 and P04-1444).* 23
- 19a. PLANNING CASES P04-1557: Proposal by Century American Development Corporation to amend the Municipal Code (Title 19) to rezone approximately 38.6 acres of land located at the southeast corner of Chicago Avenue and Krameria Street, from the R-1-125-SP Single Family Residential Zone to the R-1-100-SP Single Family Residential - Orangecrest Specific Plan

	Combining Zone. <i>(These cases are being heard concurrently with Planning Cases P04-1372 and related to P04-1238). (The applicant requests continuance to the February 3, 2005 meeting and staff concurs.)</i>	25
19b.	PLANNING CASE P04-1372: Proposed Tract Map No. 32997, a proposal by Century American Development Corporation to subdivide approximately 38.6 acres of land into 100 residential lots and one open space/detention lot located at the southeast corner of located at the southwest corner of Chicago Avenue and Krameria Street in the R-1-125-SP Single Family Residential - Orangecrest Specific Plan Combining Zone. <i>(This case is being heard concurrently with Planning Cases P04-1557 and is related to P04-1238). (The applicant requests continuance to the February 3, 2005 meeting and staff concurs.)</i>	25
19c20a.	PLANNING CASE P04-1238 (Annexation 101- Mariposa Avenue): Consideration of an annexation report and plan for providing services and to establish appropriate pre-zoning and General Plan land use designations to be placed on approximately 225 vacant acres generally bounded by Gamble Avenue to the west, Krameria Avenue to the north, Mariposa Avenue to the south and Obsidian Drive to the east. <i>(This case is related to P04-0912, P04-1372 and P04-1557).</i>	26
19d20b.	PLANNING CASE P04-0912: Proposed Tract Map No. 32646, a proposal by M.R. South Partners, L.P. to subdivide 80.44 acres into 96 residential lots and 2 open space/detention basin lots located at the southwest corner of Chicago Avenue and Krameria Street in the R-1-125-SP Single Family Residential - Orangecrest Specific Plan Combining Zone and the R-A-SP Residential Agricultural - Orangecrest Specific Plan Combining Zone. <i>(This case is being heard concurrently with Planning Cases P04-0979, and is related to P04-1238).</i>	26
WORKSHOP	34
DISCUSSION OF FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS	34
MISCELLANEOUS PLANNING AND ZONING ITEMS	34
MINUTES	34
ADJOURNMENT	34

PLANNING/ZONING MATTERS FROM THE AUDIENCE

There were none.

CONSENT CALENDAR

1. **PLANNING CASE P04-1469:** Proposed design review by the City of Riverside Park & Recreation Department for the construction of a 11,596 square-foot fitness center addition attached to the southerly portion of the existing 12,085 square-foot Arlanza Community Center building at John Bryant Park, an approximately 20.7-acre neighborhood park located on the southerly side of Philbin Avenue between Wohlstetter Street and Corwin Lane in the O — Official Zone.
2. **PLANNING CASE P04-1392:** Proposal by Richmond American Homes for the Design Review of the plot plan and building elevations for an approved planned residential development consisting of 55 single family detached residences together with parking, private and common open space on approximately 6.87 acres of vacant land located at 4962 Dewey Avenue, situated on the southerly side of Dewey Avenue, westerly of Carlo Way, in the in the R-1-65 - Single Family Residential Zone.

Commissioner Leonard referred to Item 2, noting that he does not wish to pull it for discussion, but would like to note that the applicant is using a darker color scheme for the homes, which is fine; however, on the side elevations (particularly the farm house elevation) he would like the applicant to work with staff on providing a variation for additional lighter colors to create less of an overbearing appearance.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Leonard, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Stephens, **TO APPROVE** the above items.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES: None.

NOES: None.

DISQUALIFIED: None.

ABSTAINED: None.

ABSENT: Norton

3. **PLANNING CASE P04-1382:** Proposal for design review of a plot plan and building elevations by Gary Fairchild on behalf of Sterling Housing, for a 152 unit, 528 bedroom, student housing complex together with commercial retail lease space on approximately 5.15 acres at 1300, 1360 and 1410 University Avenue, situated on the south side of University Avenue, west of Iowa Avenue, in the C-2-SP - Restricted Commercial and Specific Plan (University Avenue) Combining Zones.

Thomas Webb, landscape architect for the project, requested that this item be pulled for discussion. He stated that they approve of all conditions except Condition 3. He explained that they did not want to create billboards and alleys on the project, but adjacent to the IHOP and at the back of IHOP they are asking for a block wall. They would like to accept that; also, on the west side there is an easement that comes onto the property that they have a right to use—they did not want to build a block wall along that easement for the alley. Their proposal in those two places and elsewhere on the property where it is appropriate for staff, is to put in wrought iron, landscaping, and vines to preclude that heaviness and boxed-in feeling you get from a block wall. This would also deter graffiti.

Yvette Sennewald, Associate Planner, noted that would be acceptable to staff.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Stephens, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Kurani, **TO APPROVE** P04-1382, subject to staff's findings, recommendations, and conditions, **WITH MODIFICATION** to include the request as referenced above by Mr. Webb.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES: None.

NOES: None.

DISQUALIFIED: None.

ABSTAINED: None.

ABSENT: Norton

4. **PLANNING CASE P04-0950** (*Continued from January 6, 2005*) : Proposal by Pete Mitchell on behalf of EMS Real Estate for the Design Review of the plot plan and building elevations for an approved senior citizens housing project consisting of 224 one and two-bedroom independent senior apartment units on approximately 10.7 acres developed with two single family residences situated southerly of Colorado Avenue, westerly of Snowberry Avenue and Adams Elementary School and northerly of Raintree Avenue, in the R-1-65 - Single Family Residential Zone. (*Related Planning Case - P04-0075.*) (***The applicant requests continuance off calendar and staff concurs.***)

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Stephens, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Kurani, **TO CONTINUE** P04-0950 off calendar.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES: None.

NOES: None.

DISQUALIFIED: None.

ABSTAINED: None.

ABSENT: Norton

DISCUSSION CALENDAR

5. **ADMINISTRATIVE PLANNING CASE P04-1080:** Proposed Minor Conditional Use Permit by Mark Moscal on behalf of Nations Rent to install a 2,000 gallon above ground fuel tank for non-commercial use at an existing equipment rental and storage facility on approximately 6 acres located at 3275 Columbia Avenue, situated at the northwesterly corner of Columbia Avenue and Primer Street, in the C-3 General Commercial Zone.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Leonard, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Kurani, **TO CONTINUE** P04-1080 to the meeting of February 3, 2005.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES: None.

NOES: None.

DISQUALIFIED: None.

ABSTAINED: None.

ABSENT: Norton

6. **PLANNING CASE P04-1416:** Proposal for design review of building elevations by Eric Sautter, AIA on behalf of Rufus Barkley, for the exterior remodeling of two office-industrial buildings, totaling approximately 40,000-square-feet in area, on 3 acres, situated on the southeasterly corner of Kansas Avenue and La Cadena Drive, in the M-1– Light Manufacturing Zone.

Commissioner Comer was disqualified from participating in this hearing due to a potential financial conflict of interest.

John Swiecki, Principal Planner, presented the staff report.

Eric Sautter, Principal Architect with Sautter Architecture, 409 Harbor Avenue, Claremont, distributed an exhibit to the Commission. He introduced Rufus Barkley, the applicant and developer of the project. He explained that the hand-out given to the Commission is to help them understand their approach. He stated that contrary to the aerial photograph and the staff report, these buildings are being significantly impacted by the new freeway interchange. This interchange removes all the existing office and industrial structures between the freeway and their buildings, giving them significant visibility to anyone driving into and through Riverside. The site change makes this building highly visible and isolates it from the surrounding industrial area. They believe this necessitates a visual change to the area, one more in keeping with the City entry point nature of the site. He stated their design is reflective of this new site importance and the change of scale thrust upon by the new freeway construction. They seek to define a new sense of place for this site. He referred to Page 2, noting that the scale of the light pillars is a response to the new freeway ramps. These ramps will be up to 100 feet in the air and are to be supported by numerous large scale concrete pillars. He indicated that their structures are currently very low and very horizontal, surrounded by tall trees and poorly articulated architecture. He disagrees that the columns are out of context and not of an appropriate scale. Not only do they address the new scale of the site, but they do exactly what the design review guidelines call for, which is break up the wall masses and provide the building with articulation. He stated that if they follow what staff asked for, which was to lower the columns to parapet height, they would neither articulate the building mass nor in his opinion be in scale to the site. He believes the pillars are both in scale and proportion to both the site and the building. He stated that from their meeting with Planning staff, it was his understanding that this was the only element staff had an objection to; however, the staff report indicates otherwise. He explained that they selected colors that reflect the site's new context. He indicated that these colors are commonly associated with both the freeway and travel. They are attempting to make that visual connection. In addition, regardless of what association some people may have with these colors, they are commonly used. He noted that the building lighting will be subtle. The light ban producing the halo effect is a very common architectural element. It is often done in historic districts to light architectural cornices. The upper illustration of Page 3 shows lighting commonly done on Shell station canopies. The lower illustration is what they are proposing; it is neither bold nor bright and will be subtle and understated and will still give this visually important building a presence in the Riverside landscape when seen from the freeway 300 feet away. He indicated that any signage would appear merely as shadows against the halo background. They are lighting architectural forms and not signs. He stated that staff seems to feel this is not a stand-out building and therefore should look like everything else in the area. He commented that this is not historic Downtown Riverside, nor is it a delicate residential neighborhood where these concerns might be valid. It is an old and tired, gray industrial area, which is not open to view to all who travel through Riverside. He commented that it looks like Colton from the I-10. He stated staff seems to argue that because the area is gray, bland and monotonous now, it should remain so and that any improvements should gray, bland and monotonous rather than vital and rich. He stated that he cringes when he hears staff imply that only the gray color is okay because the other adjacent buildings are gray. In an area that has absolutely no positive aesthetic attributes, to improve and move forward they cannot just match their neighbors attributes. He stated the staff report states they are not generally compatible with the surrounding area, but are in an effort to modernize what is an older industrial area. He stated, yes, that is what they are trying to do; isn't that what the City should want? He stated that he has a great deal of respect for the City of Riverside Planning Department as he considers it one of the more

progressive planning departments in the State. He stated he was a Senior Associate with the Arroyo Group for ten years and knows it is difficult to define appropriate architectural guidelines and to critique designs while still respecting the experience and expertise of the architect. In this case, he believes the staff does not fully recognize the importance of this site, nor the tremendous opportunity they have to upgrade a tired and neglected part of the City.

Commissioner Densmore asked if the colors and design improvements the Commission is looking at today is more for aesthetics, more to upgrade the area, or more for visibility from the freeway.

Mr. Sautter stated for all three elements. He explained they are trying to get visibility from the freeway, which is one of the positive elements of this site for his client; however, they are based on an aesthetic decision and upon references to colors that are part of our freeway experience and the landscape. He stated they are happy to discuss the colors with staff and they already have made some subtle changes to the colors; however, it appears staff generally objects to the entire design and not just the color range.

Commissioner Leonard indicated that in the staff report there is a reference to a soft purple glow at the bottom of the 12 feet; however, he does not see it in the elevations.

Mr. Sautter explained that is because it is so subtle.

Rufus Barkley, 3685 Main Street, Suite 220, addressed the project from an ownership and marketing standpoint. He stated they want this building to stand out and want people driving by to recognize it. He explained that the existing buildings are non-descriptive and there are a number of metal buildings in the area, some of which have been removed. He further addressed the project.

Finn Comer of Lee & Associates spoke in support of the project.

Commissioner Densmore expressed his support for the project.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Densmore, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Singletary, **TO APPROVE** P04-1416, subject to the findings, recommendations, and conditions of staff, **WITH MODIFICATION** to delete Conditions 11 a through d.

MOTION PASSED by a vote of 5 ayes to 2 noes.

AYES: Agnew, Densmore, Kurani, Singletary, Stephens

NOES: Brown, Leonard

DISQUALIFIED: Comer

ABSTAINED: None.

ABSENT: Norton

Chair Leonard advised of the appeal procedure.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 7a. **PLANNING CASE P04-0803 (Continued from January 6, 2005):** Proposed Tract Map 32476 by CSL Engineering on behalf of the Merickel Companies to subdivide approximately 23 acres of vacant land into 34 lots for the future development of single family residences, situated on the southerly side of the future extension of Norwood Avenue, westerly of College Avenue, in the RC - Residential Conservation and R-1-65-Single Family Residential Zones. *(This case is being concurrently heard with Planning Case P04-0967.) (The applicant requests further continuance to the February 17, 2005 meeting and staff concurs.)*
- 7b. **PLANNING CASE P04-0967 (Continued from January 6, 2005):** Proposed general plan amendment by CSL Engineering on behalf of the Merickel Companies to amend the General Plan land use designation for approximately 8.8 acres of vacant land situated on the southerly side of the future extension of Norwood Avenue, westerly of College Avenue from RHS - Hillside Residential to RLD - Low Density Residential. *(This case is being heard concurrently with Planning Case P04-0803.) (The applicant requests further continuance to the February 17, 2005 meeting and staff concurs.)*
- 8a. **PLANNING CASE P04-1120 (Continued from January 6, 2005):** Proposed conditional use permit by Kassab Ama to establish a service station and mini-mart with off-site alcohol sales on approximately one vacant acre, situated on the northerly corner of Market Street and Rivera Street, in the C-2 Restricted Commercial Zone. *(This case is being heard concurrently with P04-1157 and P04-1119.) (The applicant requests further continuance to February 3, 2005 and staff concurs.)*
- 8b. **PLANNING CASE P04-1157 and P04-1119 (Continued from January 6, 2005):** Proposed conditional use permit by Kassab Ama to establish an approximately 5,000 square foot market with off-site alcohol sales, and a design review of the plot plan and building elevations for an approximately 10,000 square foot, one-story commercial building and related parking, on an approximately one vacant acre, situated on the northwesterly side of Rivera Street, between Market Street and Allstate Drive in the C-2 Restricted Commercial Zone. *(These cases to be heard concurrently with P04-1120.) (The applicant requests further continuance to February 3, 2005 and staff concurs.)*
9. **PLANNING CASE P04-0728 (Continued from January 6, 2005):** Proposed conditional use permit by Keith and Alicia Cunningham to expand an elderly board and care facility to allow up to 18 ambulatory clients on approximately 1 acre, developed with an existing board and care facility at 3715 Monroe Street, situated the northeasterly side of Monroe Street, southeasterly of Magnolia Avenue, in the R-1-65 Single Family Residential Zone. *(The applicant requests further continuance to the February 3, 2005 meeting and staff concurs.)*
- 10a. **PLANNING CASE P04-1289 (Continued from January 6, 2005):** Proposed conditional use permit by Terry Talley on behalf of Neal T. Baker Enterprises to construct an approximately 2,100 square foot fast food restaurant with a drive thru "Baker's" on approximately 1.06 vacant acres at 1300 West Blaine Street, situated on the southwesterly corner of Blaine Street and Iowa Avenue, in the C-2 - Restricted Commercial Zone. *(This case to be heard concurrently with Planning Cases P04-1290 and P04-1292.) (The applicant requests further continuance to the February 3, 2005 meeting and staff concurs.)*
- 10b. **PLANNING CASE P04-1290 (Continued from January 6, 2005):** Proposed conditional use permit by William Navigato to construct and operate an approximately 2,244 square foot automotive oil change facility "Grease Monkey" on approximately 1.06 vacant acres at 1300 West Blaine Street, situated on the southwesterly corner of Blain Street and Iowa Avenue, in the C-2 - Restricted Commercial Zone. *(This case to be heard concurrently with Planning Cases P04-1289 and P04-1292.) (The applicant requests further continuance to the February 3, 2005 meeting and staff concurs.)*
- 10c. **PLANNING CASE P04-1292 (Continued from January 6, 2005):** Design Review of Plot Plan and Building Elevations by Terry Talley on behalf of Neal T. Baker Enterprises for an approximately 2,100 square foot fast food restaurant with a drive thru and an approximately 2,244 square foot automotive oil

change facility "Grease Monkey" on approximately 1.06 vacant acres at 1300 West Blaine Street, situated on the southwesterly corner of Blaine Street and Iowa Avenue, in the C-2 - Restricted Commercial Zone. *(This case to be heard concurrently with Planning Cases P04-1289 and P04-1290.) (The applicant requests further continuance to the February 3, 2005 meeting and staff concurs.)*

11. **PLANNING CASE P04-1031** *(Continued from January 6, 2005)*: Proposal of Eddy Sutiono, on behalf of the Sugarbush Properties, for variances related to the installation of two freestanding signs on 18 acres developed with a commercial center, "University Town Center", at 1756 University Avenue, situated on the southwest corner of University and Chicago Avenues, in the C-2 - Restricted Commercial Zone. **Variances requested:** 1) to allow a 40-foot high, double-face freestanding sign with a sign area of 250-square-feet and nine lines of copy along Chicago Avenue, where the Zoning Code allows a maximum 25-foot high, double-face freestanding sign with a maximum sign area of 100-square feet and three lines of copy; 2) to allow a 40-foot high, double-face freestanding sign with a sign area of 250-square-feet and nine lines of copy along University Avenue, where the Zoning Code allows a 6-foot high, double-face freestanding sign with a maximum sign area of 25-square-feet and two lines of copy. *(The applicant requests further continuance to February 17, 2005.)*
12. **PLANNING CASES P04-1306 AND P04-1307**: Proposed conditional use permit and the design review of a plot plan and building elevations by Reeves Associates on behalf of Lake Development Group to establish a 15,004 square-foot drug store with a drive-thru pharmacy and a 1,152 square-foot restaurant building on an approximately 1.23 acre site developed with a used car dealership and auto repair facility at 3375 Market Street, situated on the westerly side of Market Street between 3rd and 4th Streets, in the DSP-RC - Downtown Specific Plan - Raincross District. *(Staff recommends continuance off calendar.)*

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Kurani, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Densmore, **TO CONTINUE** the above cases to their dates noted.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES: Agnew, Brown, Comer, Densmore, Kurani, Leonard, Singletary, Stephens

NOES: None.

DISQUALIFIED: None.

ABSTAINED: None.

ABSENT: Norton

13. **PLANNING CASES P04-1302 & P04-1304 (Continued from January 6, 2005):** Proposal of Canty Engineering Group, Inc. on behalf of the Hindu Society of the Inland Empire for a revised conditional use permit and design review of a plot plan and building elevations to establish an approximately 34,000 square-foot two-story multiple purpose building including office and classroom space on approximately 2.28 acres of land developed with two single family residences and related accessory structures located at 3733 - 3771 Everest Avenue, situated on the easterly side of Everest Avenue, approximately 200 feet southerly of Magnolia Avenue in the R-1-65 - Single Family Residential and P - Parking Zones.

Kelly Violette, Assistant Planner, presented the staff report.

Commissioner Densmore inquired as to where overflow parking would go in the event the building is at its maximum capacity.

John Swiecki, Principal Planner, stated the Code issue of parking is based on the largest assembly room, which is how the Code establishes parking for these kinds of religious institutions. He explained that what they are providing based on the largest seating of the larger facility is well in excess of what the Code requires. In terms of operationally, would they ever have both rooms fully occupied? He suggested the applicant address the operational characteristics.

Commissioner Leonard stated he noticed there is substantial parking right across the street that serves other uses. He inquired as to whether the applicant could potentially acquire some parking there through a mutual parking agreement.

Doug Shackelton of Canty Engineering, 2010 Iowa Avenue, representing the applicant, thanked staff for their work on this project. He stated that the Hindu Temple has been at this location for 11 years and has expanded to the point where they very much need this multi-purpose building. He explained the intent is to use the existing building exclusively for temple purposes and move out all the other functions into this new distinctively designed complimentary facility. He explained that they have an arrangement with the owner of a parking lot across Everest. On those hoildays or feast days where there is great parking demand, they do use that parking and do need those ten spaces in their judgment. He asked that Condition 11 be modified to adjust the hours of operation to 11:00 p.m. and 12:00 a.m. on Friday and Saturday. He explained that they have a few events during the year that will go to 11:00 or 12:00, depending upon the day. He does not think that will be a issue for the neighborhood; there is no serving of meat or alcohol and it is highly controlled and compatible. He referred to Condition 20, stating that there are two houses and vacant land that they are expanding onto. He assured the Commission there are no plants or animals on this land; they have leveled and graded this vacant land and at times use it for parking for large feast days and large events. It has been trampled and used and they have had a number of use permits where the City has granted them permission 100% for parking. He explained that there is nothing on the property that would justify that finding and he asked the Commission delete Condition 20.

Harry Kurani, 4099 Polk Street, stated he has been involved with this temple for quite a few years . He spoke in support of the project.

Commissioner Comer asked staff to respond to Mr. Shackelton's request for modification of Conditions 11 and 20.

Mr. Swiecki stated based on the testimony of prior use of the property, staff has no objection to the changes requested.

Rebecca Russel, the owner of Q Bonker Billiards and the parking used by the Temple, stated there are approximately 28 parking spaces that are used by the Temple if ever their parking has an overflow. She opens the other gate and

allows the Temple to use their parking. She commented that she has no problem with this as the Temple has always been a good neighbor and never leaves the parking area dirty. She explained that this arrangement is a verbal one.

Commissioner Densmore asked Ms. Russel if she would be willing to make a more formal agreement with the church.

Ms. Russell stated she has no problem doing that.

The head priest of the Temple spoke next in favor of the project.

Following a brief discussion the public hearing was closed and the following motion was made:

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Stephens, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Comer, **TO APPROVE** P04-1302 and P04-1304, subject to the findings, recommendations, and conditions of staff, **WITH MODIFICATION** to delete Condition 20 and replace with the following language: **“In approving this case, it has been determined that there is no evidence before the City that the proposed project will have any potential for adverse effect on wildlife resources and the impacts of the project are found to be de minimis pursuant to Section 711.4 of the Fish and Game Code.”** To modify Condition 11 as requested by Mr. Shackelton, and to add the following advisory condition: “It is noted that the adjacent property owner (Q Bonkers) has agreed to a potential parking agreement to be put in writing.” The motion also includes the recommendation for adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES: Agnew, Brown, Comer, Densmore, Leonard, Singletary, Stephens

NOES: None.

DISQUALIFIED: Kurani

ABSTAINED: None.

ABSENT: Norton

Chairman Agnew advised of the appeal procedure.

- 14a. **PLANNING CASE P04-1358** *(Continued from January 6, 2005)*: Proposal by Gilles Sayah for a variance related to the construction of an approximately 6,684 square foot commercial building on approximately 0.54 vacant acres at 2308 University Avenue, situated on the southwesterly corner of University and Eucalyptus Avenues, in the C-2-SP-Restricted Commercial and Specific Plan Combining Zone. **Variance requested:** to permit direct alley access to the proposed off-street parking area where an internal circulation system is required. *(This case to be heard concurrently with P04-1081).*
- 14b. **PLANNING CASE P04-1081** *(Continued from January 6, 2005)*: Proposal for design review of a plot plan and building elevations by Elias Alfata on behalf of Gill Sayah for an approximately 6,684 square foot commercial building on approximately 0.54 vacant acres at 2308 University Avenue, situated on the southwesterly corner of University and Eucalyptus Avenues, in the C-2-SP-Restricted Commercial and Specific Plan Combining and "P"-Parking Zones. *(This case to be heard concurrently with P04-1358).*

Don Dinkel, Associate Planner, presented the staff report.

Elias Alfata, the applicant, thanked staff for their help with this project. He noted that he concurs with the conditions.

There was no one in the audience to speak to this case.

The public hearing was officially closed.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Comer, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Singletary, **TO APPROVE** P04-1358 and P04-1081, subject to the findings, recommendations and conditions of staff, including the recommendation for adoption of a Negative Declaration.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES: Agnew, Brown, Comer, Densmore, Leonard, Singletary, Stephens

NOES: None.

DISQUALIFIED: None.

ABSTAINED: None.

ABSENT: Kurani, Norton

Chairman Agnew advised of the appeal procedure.

15. **PLANNING CASE P04-1324:** Proposed Parcel Map 33064 by IW Consulting Engineers, Inc. on behalf of Bill and Diana Reeves, to subdivide approximately 3.73 acres developed with a single family residence into two lots at 2525 Raeburn Drive situated at the terminus of Raeburn Drive and southerly of Victoria Avenue in the R-1-130 - Single Family Residential Zone.

Commissioner Kurani rejoined the Commission.

Yvette Sennewald, Associate Planner, presented the staff report. She noted that staff received four letters in support of this project.

Andrew Walker of IW Consulting stated that they concur with the conditions of approval.

The public hearing was officially closed.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Comer, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Singletary, **TO APPROVE** P04-1324, subject to the findings, recommendations and conditions of staff, including the recommendation for adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES: Agnew, Brown, Comer, Densmore, Kurani, Leonard, Singletary, Stephens

NOES: None.

DISQUALIFIED: None.

ABSTAINED: None.

ABSENT: Norton

Chairman Agnew advised of the appeal procedure.

Commissioner Kurani rejoined the Commission.

16. **PLANNING CASE P04-1354:** Proposed Tract Map 31849 (revised) by Sake Engineers Inc, on behalf of Harry L. Young to subdivide approximately 4.18 acres into 19 lots, situated on the southwest corner of Tyler Street and Hedrick Avenue in the RR-Rural Residential (tentative R-1-65–Single Family Residential) Zone. *(This case to be heard concurrently with P04-1452, P04-1453 and P04-1454)*

Mike Coyazo, Senior Planner, presented the staff report.

Mr. Sam, the engineer for the project, representing Sake Engineers, 400 S. Ramona, Corona, presented his project. He referred to Conditions 6 and 7, stating that one of the lot widths are going to be reduced from 60 to 58 ½ feet. He referred to the 66-foot right-of-way, stating that they are revising the approved tentative map and would like to request a variance for 60 feet instead. He stated they

Commissioner Leonard stated there are three lots that were removed from this project, two of them show an additional dedication for Tyler to accomplish a 55-foot half width; one of them does not show that dedication. He asked what is the intent or is there an ability to pick that up.

Mr. Sam stated that one of the lots already had the dedication and the other two they are proposing, as Mr. Coyazo mentioned will undergo a lot line adjustment with a dedication of 55 foot right-of-way.

Mr. Coyazo explained staff is recommending lot line adjustment for those three lots that are labeled “not-a-part” as part of the lot line adjustment, Public Works will be asking for the 55-foot dedication.

Harry Young, the owner of the property, stated that he bough this property in the late 60's, early 70's. He stated he has tried to sell this land, but due to the area and the issues with the homeless he has not been able to. He urged the Commission to support the project.

The public hearing was officially closed.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Stephens, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Kurani, **TO APPROVE** P04-1354, subject to the findings, recommendations, and conditions of staff, **WITH MODIFICATION** to add the following condition: “A variance is granted based on the Planning Commission’s findings to allow either Lot 6 or 7 to maintain a width of 58.5 feet where 60 feet is required” and to revised Condition 6 to add the last sentence, “... with the exception of 58 ½ foot for one lot.” The motion also includes the recommendation for adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES: Agnew, Brown, Comer, Densmore, Kurani, Leonard, Singletary, Stephens

NOES: None.

DISQUALIFIED: None.

ABSTAINED: None.

ABSENT: Norton

Chairman Agnew advised of the appeal procedure.

UNAPPROVED DRAFT MINUTES

- 17a. **PLANNING CASE P04-1452:** Proposed Tract Map 33158 by Sake Engineers, Inc, on behalf of Harry Young, to subdivide approximately 3.18 vacant acres into 12 single family residential lots, situated on the east side of Jones Avenue, between Hedrick and Wells Avenues in the RR-Rural Residential (proposed R-1-65) Zone. *(This case to be heard concurrently with P04-1354, P04-1453 and P04-1454)*
- 17b. **PLANNING CASE P04-1453:** Proposed general plan amendment by Sake Engineers, Inc on behalf of Harry Young, to amend the land use designation of approximately 3.18 vacant acres, situated on the east side of Jones Avenue, between Hedrick and Wells Avenues, from the RSR-Semi-Rural Residential to the RMD-Medium Density Residential designation. *(This case to be heard concurrently with P04-1354, P04-1452 and P04-1454)*
- 17c. **PLANNING CASE P04-1454:** Proposed rezoning by Sake Engineers, Inc on behalf of Harry Young, to amend the Municipal Code (Title 19) to rezone approximately 3.18 vacant acres situated on the east side of Jones Avenue, between Hedrick and Wells Avenues, from the RR-Rural Residential Zone to the R-1-65-Single Family Residential Zone. *(This case to be heard concurrently with P04-1354, P04-1452 and P04-1453)*

Mike Coyazo, Senior Planner, presented the staff report. He noted that on Page 11, Conditions 34, 35, and 36 should be conditions 1, 2 and 3.

Commissioner Brown asked if this case has been reviewed under the context of the forthcoming General Plan.

Mr. Coyazo stated that staff reviewed this against the existing General Plan and pointed out that the proposed General Plan would not be any different as it is still proposing semi-rural residential with the boundaries as shown.

Sam Akbarpour, Sake Engineers addressed the Commission. He noted that Mr. Young has owned this property for over 35 years and described the problems associated with the site. He also noted that they have a petition signed by all of the property owners in the area who support this project and do not understand why Mr. Young is not developing this site. Potential buyers are turned off by the appearance of the site and he asked that the Commission approve the request to allow them to clean up the area. He asked that the required right-of-way be changed to 60 feet as it would accommodate the circulation. Sixty-six feet would cause them to lose one lot.

Commissioner Densmore stated the fact that they improving the area begs the question of the underlying designation of the General Plan. The fact they are unable to sell lots might speak more to the price that the owner is charging as opposed to what it could be used for. He asked if there is anything at all that would prevent the applicant from developing that piece of property consistent with the RR underlying zone.

The engineer stated that is not feasible. He inquired as to who would buy a one-half acre in this neighborhood.

Commissioner Leonard stated on the previous map on the adjacent property, which staff was supporting, there was a determination about the effect of the 66-foot wide street not affecting the lots, and would allow them to meet all the standards. He noted that staff did not make such a finding with this request as staff is recommending denial. He asked if staff has evaluated whether or not a 66-foot-wide street would affect the lots.

Mr. Coyazo stated staff determined the lots have sufficient depth to accommodate the 66-foot-wide street to the R-1-65 standards.

Commissioner Leonard inquired as to whether that includes Lot 1.

Mr. Coyazo stated yes and noted that he believes all of the lots would have sufficient depth.

The engineer stated by taking six feet away from those lots, they are losing square footage.

Mr. Coyazo stated that the smallest lot is 7,400 square feet, so it appears they could lose the three foot off the front and still maintain the minimum 7,000 square foot lot size.

The engineer stated they do not have a problem with that.

Harry Young, the applicant, stated that he has owned this property for years and has tried to get rid of it or sell it because he just cannot do anything with the area. He has also had numerous complaints from the neighbors. He urged the Commission to support their project.

Commissioner Densmore stated that, once again, Mr. Young has an opportunity here to develop two lots; one of which has been increased in density to R-1-165 and are transitioning into a semi-rural lifestyle and to make those two developments compatible. He asked Mr. Young if they are saying there are only two alternatives: one, a development as what they are proposing, or two, no development at all.

Mr. Young stated that is the way it has been in the past. Every time he talks with someone who might want to purchase the property, they back out when they see the land and find out what it is zoned. He stated that when he purchased this property back in the late 60's, it was zoned Commercial; it was then annexed into the City the zone was changed a few times. He has been back and forth with the Planning Department on what he can do with this property.

The public hearing was officially closed.

Commissioner Leonard stated the applicants testimony was not particularly helpful in terms of the merits of R-1 versus R-R as he is left with the presumption it can be done either way; however, he also looks at the fact this is a designation that is cut mid-block, there are some substandard lots under the RSR designation to the north of the map and this would probably create a impetuous for the parcels to the north defined by Hedrick and Jones to come in in the future with proposals to go to R-1 Zoning as well. The question is, would a street be better suited as a dividing line between those designations in mid-block as the designation currently shows. He stated that the fact the applicant has gone the extra mile in buying land and assembling property and making a circulation system that now works from a drainage standpoint and a circulation standpoint, justifies some benefit to making those efforts.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Leonard, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Kurani, **TO APPROVE** the above cases, subject to the recommendations and conditions of staff, including the recommendation for adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Commissioner Leonard stated the pattern is such that he thinks the streets make a better definition for the designation rather than mid-block, including the fact that the design itself as you go south already has transition built in, with lots that are 11,000 to 12,000 feet in size, transitioning to the larger lots to the south. He feels those cover the basis in terms of maintaining compatibility.

Commissioner Densmore stated absolutely not and expressed his concern that there are other alternatives to developing this piece of property. He commented that the fact that the residents want this property cleaned up does not necessarily mean they want congested housing built next to them.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION MADE by Commissioner Densmore, **SECONDED** by Chairman Agnew, **TO DENY** the above cases.

Commissioner Brown inquired as to whether staff is willing to help the applicant find the means to accommodate less number of lots.

John Swiecki, Principal Planner, stated there is still the issue of a policy direction because staff needs the policy direction if this is going to be conventional residential or semi-rural lifestyle. They are two entirely different zones. He explained that the proposal is not consistent with the proposed General Plan.

Chairman Agnew explained that he seconded the motion because he believes the project is transitioning into an area set aside for a rural lifestyle. If you look at the zoning map you can see pieces being eaten away at this area and he does not feel that is appropriate.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION FAILED by a vote of 3 ayes to 4 noes.

AYES: Agnew, Brown, Densmore

NOES: Comer, Kurani, Leonard, Singletary

DISQUALIFIED: None.

ABSTAINED: None.

ABSENT: Norton, Stephens

The original motion was restated and acted upon as follows:

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Leonard, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Kurani, **TO APPROVE** the above cases, subject to the recommendations and conditions of staff, including the recommendation for adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration.

MOTION PASSED by a vote of 4 ayes to 2 noes and 1 abstention.

AYES: Comer, Kurani, Leonard, Singletary

NOES: Agnew, Densmore

DISQUALIFIED: None.

ABSTAINED: Brown

ABSENT: Norton, Stephens

Chairman Agnew advised of the appeal procedure.

The Commission recessed for lunch at this time.

Commissioner Stephens did not return after lunch.

- 18a. **PLANNING CASE P04-1094:** Proposed General Plan Amendment by Watt Developers to amend the land use designation of approximately 20 acres developed with a drive-in theater, situated between Van Buren Boulevard and Gibson Street approximately 680 feet northwesterly of Lincoln Avenue from the PKO Other Recreation to RMD Medium High Density Residential . *(This case is being heard concurrently with Planning Cases P04-1095, P04-1444, P04-1445 and P04-1446).*
- 18b. **PLANNING CASE P04-1095:** Proposed rezoning by Watt Developers to amend the Municipal Code (Title 19) to rezone approximately 20 acres of land developed with a drive-in theater, situated between Van Buren Boulevard and Gibson Street approximately 680 feet northwesterly of Lincoln Avenue, from the R-1-65 - Single Family Residential Zone to the R-3- 40 Multiple Family Residential Zone. *(This case is being heard concurrently with Planning Cases P04-1094, P04-1444, P04-1445 and P04-1446)*
- 18c. **PLANNING CASE P04-1444:** Proposed Tract Map 32659 by R.T. Quinn and Associates on behalf of Watt Developers to subdivide approximately 20 acres of land developed with a drive-in theater for condominium purposes to facilitate the development of a 206-unit small lot single family residential development, situated between Van Buren Boulevard and Gibson Street approximately 680 feet northwesterly of Lincoln Avenue in the R-1-65 -Single Family Residential Zone (Proposed R-3-40 - Multiple Family Residential Zone). *(This case is being heard concurrently with Planning Cases P04-1094, P04-1095 P04-1445 and P04-1446).*
- 18d. **PLANNING CASES P04-1445 and P04-1446:** Proposed planned residential development and the design review of a plot plan and building elevations by Watt Developers to establish a 206 unit small lot single family residential planned residential development together with parking, private and amenitized common open space areas on approximately 20 acres of land developed with a drive-in theater situated between Van Buren Boulevard and Gibson Street approximately 680 feet northwesterly of Lincoln Avenue, in the R-1-65 - Single Family Residential Zone (Proposed R-3-40 - Multiple Family Residential Zone). *(These cases are being heard concurrently with Planning Cases P04-1094, P04-1095 and P04-1444).*

Jeff Belier, Senior Planner, presented the staff report. He informed the Commission that the initial study was reviewed by the Cultural Heritage Board yesterday.

Kevin Webb with Watt Developers stated that they concur with the conditions of approval.

Commissioner Comer expressed his concern for more common open space, given the density of the project. He strongly believed the children should have more space to play and kick a ball around. He also felt that a second pool somewhere in the center of the project would be beneficial and more evenly accessible.

Commissioner Densmore agreed.

Following further discussion, it was the consensus of the Commission that the applicant of this project needed to revise the plan to include more common open space and amenities for the project.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Kurani, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Densmore, **TO CONTINUE** the above cases to the meeting of February 17, 2005.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES: Agnew, Brown, Comer, Densmore, Kurani, Leonard, Singletary

NOES: None.

DISQUALIFIED: None.

ABSTAINED: None.

ABSENT: Norton, Stephens

Commissioner Stephens re-joined the Commission at this time.

- 19a. **PLANNING CASES P04-1557:** Proposal by Century American Development Corporation to amend the Municipal Code (Title 19) to rezone approximately 38.6 acres of land located at the southeast corner of Chicago Avenue and Krameria Street, from the R-1-125-SP Single Family Residential Zone to the R-1-100-SP Single Family Residential - Orangecrest Specific Plan Combining Zone. *(These cases are being heard concurrently with Planning Cases P04-1372 and related to P04-1238). (The applicant requests continuance to the February 3, 2005 meeting and staff concurs.)*
- 19b. **PLANNING CASE P04-1372:** Proposed Tract Map No. 32997, a proposal by Century American Development Corporation to subdivide approximately 38.6 acres of land into 100 residential lots and one open space/detention lot located at the southeast corner of located at the southwest corner of Chicago Avenue and Krameria Street in the R-1-125-SP Single Family Residential - Orangecrest Specific Plan Combining Zone. *(This case is being heard concurrently with Planning Cases P04-1557 and is related to P04-1238). (The applicant requests continuance to the February 3, 2005 meeting and staff concurs.)*

Chairman Agnew noted that Items 19c and 19d should actually be changed to Items 20a and 20b.

Commissioner Leonard was disqualified from participating in items 19a and 19b due to a potential financial conflict of interest.

John Swiecki, Principal Planner, introduced Patti Nahill, a contract planner doing work for the City.

Patti Nahill stated that for clarification purposes she is going to refer to the case numbers as on the agenda, not necessarily the agenda item numbers. She informed the Commissioners that Cases P04-1557 was an application for a zone change, but is now being requested for withdrawal as per the letter provided to the Commission. She explained that the applicant has instead chosen to submit a specific plan amendment to the Orangecrest Specific Plan, which will deal with his development standards instead of doing a zone change. She stated that in relationship to P04-1372 (the map that goes along with what was going to be the zone change) staff is requesting a continuance to February 17, 2005 (instead of February 3rd, as noted) as it will be related to the next two items, Items 20a and 20b. There have been some issues that have popped up related to the County and some noticing requirements. She stated that with the Commission's indulgence, they may want to table items 19a and 19b until the second two cases are heard before taking any formal action.

- 19c20a. PLANNING CASE P04-1238 (Annexation 101- Mariposa Avenue):** Consideration of an annexation report and plan for providing services and to establish appropriate pre-zoning and General Plan land use designations to be placed on approximately 225 vacant acres generally bounded by Gamble Avenue to the west, Krameria Avenue to the north, Mariposa Avenue to the south and Obsidian Drive to the east. *(This case is related to P04-0912, P04-1372 and P04-1557).*
- 19d20b. PLANNING CASE P04-0912:** Proposed Tract Map No. 32646, a proposal by M.R. South Partners, L.P. to subdivide 80.44 acres into 96 residential lots and 2 open space/detention basin lots located at the southwest corner of Chicago Avenue and Krameria Street in the R-1-125-SP Single Family Residential - Orangecrest Specific Plan Combining Zone and the R-A-SP Residential Agricultural - Orangecrest Specific Plan Combining Zone. *(This case is being heard concurrently with Planning Cases P04-0979, and is related to P04-1238).*

Patti Nahill presented the staff report. She distributed two letters to the Commission from the County: one from County Planning staff and one from the Transportation department staff. She stated that when some projects were before the Commission in the past, there were some talks of schools and parks. She indicated that in the area by Cole there has now been an option placed with the school district for purchase of that property for an elementary school site and the Commission will see this come forward in relationship to changes in maps. Also, as part of this annexation, the City will be proposing a park site in a location in the stretch here. She noted that staff received a call from an adjoining property owner, Mr. Oswald, regarding Condition 24. She explained that Public Works has conditioned under Condition 24 for full access right-of-way of Gamble. Staff has since taken a look at that and the applicant has provided an alternate design, which provides access to those lots without providing any impairment to the existing property to the west. The property owners to the west have also been advised that it would probably be in their best interest to approach the County for a vacation of the dedication that is currently there since a lot of the property owners have built over their easement. They will be pursuing that separately from this one, but staff does feel this alternative is appropriate for this particular map.

Commissioner Leonard stated that he is delighted to see that there is finally a park identified. He referred to Page 15 of the Initial Study noting that it indicates that the cost to acquire and develop approximately 14 acres of new park to serve this community is estimated to exceed the revenue amount by approximately 2.31. In short, for every dollar in park fees collected, the City will be faced with a \$3 obligation for the acquisition and construction of parks at today's cost. It then goes on to say there is no impact to parks. He asked staff how they reconcile those statements.

Ms. Nahill stated that the Plan of Services that was prepared by the Parks and Recreation Department assumed they would be doing the construction. In this particular instance, the applicant has offered to actually do a turnkey park, so the numbers quoted in the Plan of Services were raw numbers based on somebody else doing the work and not an applicant doing the work. She commented that those will be adjusted through the development process.

Commissioner Leonard asked what conditions apply to making the provision for the turn key park at a certain time before development is completed.

Ms. Nahill stated those will actually be coming before the Commission when they have the map that actually affects that property. It is not something they can actually tie to the annexation, other than creating a general plan designation. The Commission will see it when that actual piece of property comes before them.

Commissioner Leonard commented that a leap of faith is required here because they have been waiting for almost 2,000 units for a park to become a realization. He stated they are situated with a request for a map that is not going

to be tied to that and waiting on another map that is going to come in the future. He explained that he wants to make sure there is a tie-in somehow and that we can move on from there. He referred to the sewer, stating that under the original plan this area was designated for three quarter-acre lots and they had to be sewered. It was a sewer plan to take them up to Gamble right-of-way to the list stations proposed and has continued on under the current plan. He can understand there has been changes in environmental law that cause a re-evaluation of how those things were evaluated almost ten years ago; however, there was also a previous map approved on this for one-acre lots by the County before Alta Cresta came along. Those lots did not perk and the map expired. He asked what is the back-up provision in the event these lots do not perk that there will be some means of sewerage that can be extended to these lots.

Ms. Nahill stated that as a result the City has applied a Public Works condition that in the event they cannot make the septic systems work, they will have to put in sewers.

Commissioner Leonard confirmed that Ms. Nahill was referring to Condition 33. He stated that he wants to understand the developers obligation on discharge of storm flows. There is some detention basins that are shown on the map with some outlets on overflow conditions. He asked for clarification that as long as the applicant does not exceed the flow that is released from the site, that meets the intent of the law; there is no responsibility for off site down stream improvements.

Rob Van Zanten, Senior Engineer with the Public Works Department, stated that is correct. In the absence of a comprehensive master plan drainage study, they are requiring a zero net increase in discharge.

Commissioner Leonard asked if these serve detention and storm flow filtering.

Mr. Van Zanten stated that under the tentative map they are labeled as a water quality feature, which is what triggered Condition 32. He is not sure if there has been any dialogue with Regional Water Quality Control Board and if there is some mitigation measure required or if they were just taking upon themselves to provide some first flush type basins. He commented that he just wanted to clarify that if there are water quality features proposed there is going to be some stipulations as to design criteria and perpetual maintenance.

Commissioner Leonard referred to the maintenance of the facilities, stating that among the solutions offered is an endowment. He commented that he travels around many cities and all of them have some form of a public maintenance to it; it could be a landscaping and lighting district; it could be homeowners association or something. He did note there was another provision noted and he believes it was an HOA, but certainly, an endowment would seem to be the least of desirable alternatives to the maintenance of that facility. He referred to the multi-purpose recreational trail as shown on the master plan. He asked if there are provisions to carry on some form of access of multi-purpose trails at least connecting Mariposa to Van Buren.

Ms. Nahill stated there is; it still maintains the Alta Cresta Specific Plan Alignment, which is on the south side of Mariposa.

Commissioner Leonard asked if those will be conditioned on the individual tracts of where that alignment touches.

Ms. Nahill stated that is correct.

Commissioner Stephens stated that one of the letters from the County refers to an 88-foot right-of-way on Mariposa; however, he sees the exhibit before the Commission shows an 88-foot right-of-way. He inquired as to whether there is any question to having 88-feet or if the concern is more related to construction and whether or not it is off-set, etc.

Ms. Nahill stated it is the latter; the County is more concerned with the construction and the ability to construct within an 88-foot right-of-way. She stated that, fortunately, the County changed their standards last year in terms of roadway standards. They did not change the pavement, they actually changed the parkway. She stated that between the blending of the County standards and the City standards they are perfectly fine within the right-of-way of the 44 feet on both sides for a total of 88 feet.

Commissioner Stephens asked Ms. Nahill is she is recommending the Commission continue the latter two items today.

Ms. Nahill stated that it would actually be the three items; the other map as well.

Chairman Agnew asked for those in the audience who cannot attend the meeting of February 17th to speak to the Commission at this time.

John Trumbolt, 16900 Sendero Del Charro, stated he is pleased they have gone with one-acre lots that would be adjacent to theirs. His only real concern is the possibility of putting Gamble straight through. He stated that if Gamble is connected all the way through, they are going to have a road in front of their house and a road in back of their house. He commented that this really interferes with the rural nature of their livelihood—having two busy roads on either side of your house. He stated that when they worked with the County on this, they were in agreement that the houses that were behind them would have their back yards abut up to their backyards giving them a true cushion and transition between their fairly rural neighborhood and what was ultimately going to become a much more suburban type of an arrangement. He suggested that it would be really nice if Gamble was not put all the way through. This would eliminate any transition for them.

Ms. Nahill stated there are actually two sections of Gamble: one is the section on Krameria, coming down from the north. She stated there are no plans to continue that current access. From the section Mr. Trumbolt is speaking to, there are old dedications from County maps that were dedicated, but not accepted. She advised the residents in that area to pursue an abandonment or vacation of those easements, such that they never have this question come up again.

Mr. Trumbolt asked if staff is instructing them to go ahead and request a vacation.

Ms. Nahill stated no and explained that they are not continuing any roadways along Gamble.

Paul Barrios, a resident off of Mariposa and Taft, stated that he does not understand why a developer can go in and not build a park right away. He expressed his concern that he will be losing the area he and his family exercise and walk on. He also expressed concern regarding the lack of parks in their neighborhood and the heavy traffic situation. He noted that motorists speed down his road and that it is a safety hazard.

Rebecca Mach, 17080 Gamble Avenue, stated she has lived at this location since 1978. She stated that if this project goes through and two lanes are developed up Mariposa to the new project, that will leave them with 44 feet on their

side that will be dirt. Already, when she comes home and goes into her driveway, she has people passing her when she is trying to make the turn. Right now, anytime of the day or night (usually after high school lets out or before 2:00 a.m.) you can clock cars going 80-90 miles an hour on Mariposa. She explained that with the two lanes people are going to be getting onto the dirt and doing their 80-90 miles an hours. She asked who is she to call for safety purposes. Does she see if they are on the paved section and call the City; or does she see if they have gone off and escaped onto the dirt and call the County?

Mr. Van Zanten suggested that Ms. Mach contact the County Transportation Department since she is within the County and the County has jurisdiction over their road.

Don Embrey, 17895 Mariposa, expressed his concern that once the road is put in it will be damaged due to the transition of dirt to asphalt. He inquired as to why that road is 88 feet. If you go just directly west on Mariposa, you will find out that it has already pretty much been established what the width of the road is going to be. It appears to end right at Gamble. He commented that he knows it is dedicated to be that way, but there are already structures/utilities in place. He also does not understand how a developer can go in and finish his development, promising that a park will go in, but never putting in this park.

Amanda Embrey, 17895 Mariposa, stated that it does not appear the road is going to blend; it is going to be a mismatch of pavement and dirt and will create a mud situation. Also, at 17800, on the north side, there is an existing home that was used as a methamphetamine home that appears to have been vacant for some time. She inquired as to what will happen with this home if it is going to continue to stay.

Ms. Nahill stated as part of the development of the proposed tract, that home will be removed.

Mrs. Embrey asked if there are any questions as to chemicals in the existing environment.

Mr. Van Zanten stated under the Subdivision Map Act the applicant would be preparing a preliminary soils analysis of the site and would be looking for various components that would be of concern.

Mrs. Embrey inquired as to whether they would be informed of that analysis.

Mr. Van Zanten stated it all becomes public information.

Mrs. Embrey stated she was involved with the original Alta Cresta Plan; two rows of orange groves were dedicated along the road. She asked if that will still be part of the new plan.

Ms. Nahill stated the specifics of that have not been determined. What they have is about a 300-foot depth in terms of the acre lots. If it fits in with the development plans in this particular 80 acres that's being considered today, no; but, further to the east that might be a consideration as far as their development plans.

Mrs. Embrey asked if there is a middle school planned in these plans.

Ms. Nahill stated not within this plan and suggested that Mrs. Embrey call Janet Dickson at Riverside Unified School District to find out where the middle schools will be.

Ralph Oswald, 16980 Sendero Del Charro, stated he is the guy who has a problem with the road going on his property. He explained that if it is like the previous one, this road will wipe out his entire back yard, right up to the back of his house. He stated that if it is what Ms. Nahill presented, he has no problem with that as it works fine with him.

Terry Huff, 16951 Sendero Del Charro, stated he is a member of the Woodcrest Municipal Advisory Council and they have been hearing a lot of concern over the project, mainly in regard to traffic. He explained that there is 80-some homes going in and with an average of 3 cars per house this will be creating a bottleneck. He noted that they are already flowing over 50,000 cars a day down Van Buren in each direction. He commented that he did not like the layout of the houses on the northeast section. He referred to the double cul-de-sac at the upper right hand corner, pointing out that if there is an emergency and that road is blocked, there is going to be no access by emergency vehicles into those houses. He also inquired as to why this would not fall under Prop R.

Commissioner Brown asked Mr. Huff if, as a member of WAC, he has looked at this extensively.

Mr. Huff stated yes.

Commissioner Brown asked Mr. Huff to comment with regard to its adaptability to what was brought forth in WAC.

Mr. Huff stated not too long ago on Canyon Ridge there was a fire and the road was partially blocked; there is only one way in and there was fatalities over it. He was on the Riverside WAC, Western Alessandro Committee, and they studied some 28 hot spots over the City and County Roads. They were trying to eliminate situations like this where there is only one way into a housing tract.

Jeffrey Doolie, 16780 Sendero Del Charro, stated he is very happy to see that Gamble is not going to go through, but he is concerned what is going to go at the end of their property lines because everyone up there has a fence. He assumes there will be a wall between the end of their back yards and the new property. He also expressed concern regarding the traffic. He noted that there have been two fatal accidents on Van Buren in the last year.

Ivan Scott Odore, 17051 Mariposa, referred to the 88-foot road, stating that 44 foot each way would be in the center of his kitchen. Even if it was a two-lane road with the easement, his house would still be too close.

Arthur Mach, 17080 Gamble Avenue, stated that his driveway would be taken off, his leach line would be gone, and the septic tank would be half cut off. This would mean he would need to put in a brand new septic tank and leach line. He commented that he just installed a new septic tank in and spent \$5,000 on it. He noted that he never received notice about this project.

Commissioner Stephens suggested that an exhibit for this area be prepared that would cover all of these annexations that shows potential sites for parks and schools. He commented that he has made this request before; however, that was before Ms. Nahill joined the team. Also, he asked that a small handout be prepared that contains Frequently Asked Questions. He commented that there are pretty standard questions for annexations such as, "Will the zoning change affect my property? What will the infrastructure of improvements be and how will it affect my property?"

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Stephens, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Leonard, **TO CONTINUE** Items 19c and 10d (now 20a and 20b) to the meeting of February 17, 2005.

Ted Weggeland, representing the applicant, commented that they heard the Commission loud and clear the last time they were here with a project in this area. He stated that this time, the Commission now knows there is a school going up in the area; they expect to close the deal with the school district probably by February or March and to begin grading earlier than that. In regard to the park issue he stated that they have been working consistently with the City staff to try to come up with a park location and to come up with something that would work for the City, but would not be years out or after the homes were built. He explained that there has been a couple different Parks directors in the last 12-18 months and over the course of that time there has been some different ideas from the Park directors on what exactly they wanted to see. Most recently, they have had conversations with Mr. Nunez and with Mr. Gutierrez talking about the types of parks that the City would like to see up in this area. He understands the concerns about the timing and stated that the property they are talking about for this park is property that they own and not somebody else's obligation in the future. They have been talking with the City to come up with a plan to make this park work to go ahead and build a turnkey for the City as quickly as possible so that the park will actually be in before the homes are built and occupied. He commented that he can understand people in the audience having skepticism about this; however, they are doing everything they can to get that park in before the homes are up. He noted that they are in a position to do this because they own the property. He stated that he expects there will be a Homeowner's Association to take care of the maintenance issues. There are issues with Mariposa and they would be happy to work with the property owners to the south of Mariposa to see what can be done to address some concerns. It is his understanding dealing with the County of Riverside, that they are prepared to vacate the easement north of Gamble so he does not think that is an issue with the County. He has been in contact with the County and in the last couple of days they have had meetings with the Transportation Department and have satisfied all concerns.

Commissioner Leonard commented that he thinks the questions raised by the residents today can be addressed rather quickly. He stated that Gamble was never under the Alta Cresta Specific Plan proposed to be extended; it is not extended in this map, it is just residual right-of-way that has always remained and that is a moot issue; vacation process can be initiated by any owner to remove that from the books and there is no intention of using that. He is concerned about the flag lot, which will be dealt with on another day because these are generally accepted when going up slope and this one is going down. He stated that he really appreciates the effort being made on the parks. The problem has been there is no assurance and the fact the applicant has gone to the effort to buy property that was never even in the Alta Cresta project is a straight acquisition and their offering to do it as a turn key is very helpful. He referred to the improvement of Mariposa and asked for clarification that it will be 44 plus 10 in terms of paving.

Mr. Van Zanten stated based on the City's requirements there is a minimum of 28 foot of paved roadway to provide a functional street. This being an 88 foot designation, the half street width is 32 feet, which actually exceeds the minimum requirements for a functional two-way road. They would only be requiring the 32-foot half street from centerline northerly. There would be some transitions there to be able to accommodate the change in the alignment of the actual traveled ways.

Commissioner Leonard stated so that is even more good news to the residents to the south. There is no construction contemplated south of the centerline.

Mr. Van Zanten stated not under this development.

Commissioner Leonard referred to the DR Horton and JFK project and the joy of going through the improvement plans with County on the south side and City on the north side and all of the fun that represented and asked if that

will be able to be avoided in this instance. He commented he believes there was some acquisitions that had to be done and substantial improvements that had to be relocated.

Mr. Swiecki stated that is the difference between this project; the other project did involve going beyond the City limit and beyond the half street. It could not get the level of improvement withing the half street that was necessary and that did necessitate utilities from one side to the other and what not. He stated that he does not anticipate that level of complexity to implement this current plan.

Commissioner Leonard asked if Public Works would then expect the condition that exists today on Mariposa south of centerline to remain with an improvement (assuming the residents have built outside of the right-of-way), causing a dirt patch between their driveways and the beginning of pavement. He also asked how Public Works will also deal with the change of grade.

Mr. Van Zanten stated the way their records indicate there is a paper street out there; this is the public way it was accepted by the County. There is some right to maintain roadway in there even if it is an unimproved roadway. As far as he would consider any necessary grading to accommodate the proposed street improvements on the northerly half, the rights are there to perform whatever grading. He commented that these plans will go through the County Transportation Department as well for their concurrence. He stated that yes, he would envision that dirt strip to remain on the southerly side; that portion of Mariposa that exists within the County.

Commissioner Leonard commented that question was raised about the compliance with Prop R. He stated that his understanding is that the City is entertaining annexation from the County on the basis that there is an adopted specific plan in place and, therefore, Prop R is not an issue under that basis.

Mr. Swiecki stated that is correct; also, the fact that many of the properties involved in these annexations may have been historic groves, but they're not grove anymore, so there is no obligation to zone them with a RA-5 Zone. Also, the question of the applicability of some of those restrictions outside the City limit are in question as well.

Commissioner Leonard stated that question was raised about the design of the cul-de-sacs up in the northeast corner. He asked for confirmation that that design is a function of the involvement in Supervisor Buster's office on the re-design of the tract maps to the east and the realignment of Chicago and Roosevelt.

Ms. Nahill stated it did shift the right-of-way in that particular location and so that was the solution that was adopted.

Mr. Swiecki stated the double-headed cul-de-sac serves 15 lots; the City standard on a cul-de-sac maximum number of lots is 16, so it does comply with City standards as it exists today, approved by the Fire Department and the Public Works Department.

Commissioner Leonard stated that concern was raised by the residents about the County standard for Mariposa and we are having to match up to the 44 because of the memorandum of understanding of being consistent with County right-of-way.

Mr. Van Zanten stated yes; also, the street was designated as such under their Alta Cresta Specific Plan and they are not substantially changing that circulation element component.

Commissioner Leonard stated if the residents wanted to pursue the street standard, the guy to call is Juan Perez at (951) 955-6767.

Commissioner Brown commended Ms. Nahill for her excellent presentation. He commented that he has been listening to speakers for 50 years and he wishes there were more like Ms. Nahill. He proceeded to speak to proper coordination and communication between the County and City. He also commented Mr. Weggeland on his input at the WAC workshop in alleviating some of the types of issues that have come up today.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES: Agnew, Brown, Comer, Densmore, Kurani, Leonard, Singletary, Stephens

NOES: None.

DISQUALIFIED: None.

ABSTAINED: None.

ABSENT: Norton

The Commission proceeded to vote to withdraw Item 19a and continue 19b to February 17, 2005.

WORKSHOP - 12:00 p.m.

20. Continued review of the General Plan 2025 Program with emphasis on the Zoning Code. The Commission will adjourn to the Board Room for this lunch time workshop.

This workshop took place during the lunch recess in the Council Board Room.

DISCUSSION OF FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

MISCELLANEOUS PLANNING AND ZONING ITEMS

21. **Appointment of replacement Land Use Committee representative.**

Commissioner Singletary volunteered to be the Land Use Committee representative replacement for Commissioner Norton.

22. **Report from the City Planning Commission representative to the City Land Use Committee.**

There was no report.

23. **Recent City Council actions of interest to the City Planning Commission.**

John Swiecki, Principal Planner, gave a brief update on recent City Council actions.

24. **Briefing on upcoming agenda items.**

The Commission and staff wished Mr. Swiecki a fond farewell. Ken Gutierrez, Planning Director, stated that he would miss John more than anyone and thanked him for his great service.

Mr. Swiecki stated he has really enjoyed working with this particular Commission and will miss each and every member. He commented that it has been great experience working for the City of Riverside and know he is leaving it in good hands.

MINUTES

The minutes of November 4, 2004 and November 18, 2004 were approved as presented.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned to the February 3, 2005 meeting at 9:00 a.m.